2. Gross PA, Anderson RJ: Acute renal failure and toxic nephropathy, *In*, Klahr S, Massry SG (Eds): Contemporary Nephrology, Vol 3. New York, Plenum, 1985

3. Dixon BS, Anderson RJ: Nonoliguric acute renal failure. Am J Kidney Dis, in press

4. Webb JAW, Reznek RH, White FE, et al: Can ultrasound and computed tomography replace high-dose urography in patients with impaired renal function? Q J Med 1984; 53:411-425

5. Shafi T, Cou SY, Porush JG, et al: Infusion pyelography and renal function—Effects in patients with chronic renal insufficiency. Arch Intern Med 1978 Aug; 138:1218-1221

6. Kumar S, Hull JD, Lathi S, et al: Low incidence of renal failure after angiography. Arch Intern Med 1981 Sep; 141:1268-1270

7. Eisenberg R, Bank WO, Hedgcock MW: Renal failure after major angiography can be avoided with hydration. AJR 1981 May; 136:859-861

8. Olds CW, Duarte CM, Siedlecki M, et al: Effects of mannitol in the prevention of radiocontrast acute renal failure in patients with pre-existing chronic renal failure. Kidney Int 1982; 21:158

9. Berkseth RO, Kjellstrand CM: Radiologic contrast-induced nephropathy. Med Clin North Am 1984 Mar; 68:351-370

Health Care Dollars to Other Pockets

IT SEEMS REASONABLE to ask where all the health care profits are coming from and where they are going. There is considerable reason to believe that a large portion of these profits is the result of restrictions on those who provide and those who receive the services. The premise of the rhetoric we hear is that the profit motive will increase efficiency, reduce costs and eliminate the "fat"—and do all this without curtailing access or quality of care. The incentive for profit and the opportunity for competition is supposed to bring all this about, even in what may already be the most regulated health care system in the world.

There have always been profits in the health care field. The pharmaceutical industry has always done well and has had the incentives necessary to develop the wherewithal for much of the progress in patient care that has occurred. And some physicians have done very well indeed. Recently a growing number of hospitals and other health care institutions are being operated for profit. In the past, good hospitals, good skilled nursing facilities, good nursing homes and good home care agencies have not been considered very profitable operations. In fact, many, if not most, were operated "not for profit" and any "profits" were plowed back into the institution.

But now the health care system is being leached for dollars in ways it has seldom been, at least within recent memory. In the name of business efficiency, and to deal with the almost impossible complexities of government regulation, costly administrative hierarchies (with their accompanying organizational bureaucracies) are developing in hospitals and health care institutions that leach health care dollars for salaries and benefits for their ever-expanding management structures. The advertising, marketing and amenities stimulated by a growing competition for patients, pad the pocketbooks of many who actually contribute little if anything to health care. And the current orgy of malpractice and other litigation, so profitable to trial lawyers and others who thrive on litigation, adds new and often substantial costs to physicians' fees and the cost of a day's stay in hospital.

The public rhetoric continues to say—as it has for some time—that our goal is to have equal access for all to good quality medical care (although the *right* to care has been considerably muted), but that the cost of this has now become unacceptable. Yes, one may reasonably ask where all the profits in health care are coming from and where are they going. It is now becoming increasingly clear that in large measure they must be coming from restrictions on the providers of care and limitations on the options of patients who are the consumers of care, and both have had precious little to say about what is being done to them. One can only wonder if the goal should not be to get more of the needed health care from the admittedly scarce health care dollars, rather than to encourage all the competition, regulation and profiteering that divert so many needed health care dollars to other pockets.

MSMW

Adult Still's Disease—Implications of a New Syndrome

IN 1897 George Frederick Still felt it important to emphasize that the syndrome which came to bear his name be distinguished from rheumatoid arthritis in adults.[1] Almost 90 years later, we must decide if we should recognize an adult form of Still's disease as a separate nosologic entity. Citing the importance of the diagnostic, therapeutic and prognostic implications of recognizing a rare condition, several authors[2-4] have advocated the acceptance of the term adult Still's disease since it was coined by Bywaters in 1966.[5]

In this issue of the journal and elsewhere, Larson further supports this position by extensively reviewing the clinical features of the majority of reported cases of adult Still's disease and of 17 patients followed at the University of Washington.[4] In favor of recognizing adult Still's disease as a distinct syndrome is the remarkably consistent description of the clinical picture, with high fever, intense arthralgias or arthritis and a characteristic salmon-colored rash as prominent findings. Characteristically, the disease spares the metacarpophalangeal joints, a feature quite different from what is usually seen in rheumatoid arthritis. Standard serologic studies, such as antinuclear antibody and rheumatoid factor, are negative. An unusual ankylosing of the carpal bones occurs chronically; this is quite unlike more familiar rheumatic diseases, such as active rheumatoid arthritis in adults, mixed connective tissue disease or systemic lupus erythematosus.

But is this evidence enough? After all, it also is clear that the etiology is uncertain, no serologic tests are diagnostic[3] and, despite the existence of characteristic findings, in most cases the diagnosis is one of exclusion. Furthermore, probably because adult Still's disease is relatively rare, few longitudinal studies have been done. We are already learning that the disease is not as benign as once thought, with chronic arthritic changes developing in some patients. In view of this, can we be certain that patients with adult Still's disease will not eventually be found to be a subset of populations with another disease? This situation is reminiscent of what has occurred in mixed connective tissue disease where the diagnosis often rests mainly on a high titer of antiribonucleoprotein antibody. Some rheumatologists doubt the existence of mixed connective tissue disease as a distinct clinical entity; they point out that in a proportion of such patients followed for a decade or more, their disease appears to have evolved into typical systemic sclerosis or another connective tissue disorder.

Nonetheless, several standard sources of information, including *Harrison's Textbook of Medicine*, currently accept adult Still's disease as a separate disorder. The American Rheumatism Association also acknowledges its existence,[6]